

CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Communications

FROM: Chairman OC Promotion Process Review Task Force

SUBJECT: Task Force Report [ ]

REFERENCE: [ ] dated 17 May 1979

1. The Task Force created by the reference met more or less regularly from early September through December 1979. Meetings were held two days each week with the members working at regular duties the balance of the time. One three-day meeting in September, and a one-week session in late October were the only two periods during which the Task Force devoted full time to its assigned task. [ ]

2. The attached report consists of two parts. The main part of the report contains background, discussions and recommendations. The second part is an implementing attachment, which if approved, will become six new appendices (A, B, C, D, E, and F) to the OC Personnel Management Handbook [ ]

3. If the majority of the report is unsurprising, as the Task Force believes it is, one reason is that certain real constraints imposed limits on the scope of the solutions that could be developed. Three main ones were:

a. The general conclusions reached by authors of literature on promotion selection methodology is typified by G. L. Morrissey's statement in Management by Objectives and Results:

"Graduated checklists, wherein a manager is asked to rate his subordinate on a scale of 1 to 5 (or 10, or 20, or ?) on the obviously important characteristics-- such as initiative, loyalty, dependability, leadership, etc.--are as familiar as an old shoe to most managers

THE ATTACHED REPORT IN ITS ENTIRETY

CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT: Task Force Report (U)

who have been in the business world for any significant length of time. The only problem with these checklists is that, to our knowledge, no one has yet come up with a method for: (a) defining these characteristics in terms that will have a common and consistent meaning for all who must relate to them, (b) assessing the relative importance, if any, of these characteristics to on-the-job performance, (c) assuring consistency of rating among managers (or even of the same manager at different times), or (d) determining whether or not these factors actually correlate with "good management." The upshot is that even the most conscientious manager must rely almost entirely on a "gut-feel" approach to evaluation. In effect, we end up playing God with a subordinate's career on the basis of little more than a personal opinion."

b. Morrissey's book also contains a quote from Levinson's book Management by Whose Objectives? which says:

"Every organization is a social system, a network of interpersonal relationships. A man may do an excellent job by objective standards of measurement, but may fail miserably as a partner, subordinate, superior, or colleague. It is a commonplace that more people fail to be promoted for personal reasons than for technical inadequacy. . . . The plea for objectivity is vain for another reason. The greater the emphasis on measurement and quantification, the more likely the subtle non-measurable elements of the task will be sacrificed. Quality of performance frequently, therefore, loses out to quantification."

c. A third constraint emerged from discussions with the OC senior staff on the subject of "promotion versus selection." These discussions examined the problems associated with identifying and developing future managers as a by-product of a competitive performance promotion system. The Organization promotion system tends to promote its people based on how well a particular set of duties and responsibilities are acquitted in relation to other employees doing the same kinds of things.

CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT: Task Force Report (U)

The competitive system has tended to lock people into doing particular kinds of things, e.g., clerical. Such a process tends to ignore the comparison and selection of people doing different kinds of things; it also tends to ignore the fact that attributes, skills, and characteristics vary in value from grade to grade. Thus, psychomotor skills may be important at the basic grade levels whereas traits of character and personality may be of much greater significance at the more senior levels. (U)

4. The present OC competitive evaluation system (BYCELS) fails to deal effectively with managerial selection on at least two counts. It tends to promote grade-by-grade on the basis of performance without great regard to the long term potential of the individual to make a growing contribution as a manager. The second major failing of the BYCELS system has been the lack of process for selecting and developing people across technical/professional or panel lines to produce the best candidate for office-wide development. (U)

5. The Task Force addressed both of these deficiencies and hopefully has successfully addressed the issue of improving the selection criteria for promotion. The report contains a recommendation for changing the listing of attributes to be measured and the relative weighting of same. It also contains recommendations which, along with the earlier restructuring of the Career Sub-group Board, should significantly improve cross-panel assignments and other officer development techniques. Early identification and development of managers will continue to be an office-wide responsibility which can only be solved by continued close attention. (U)

6. One other issue needs to be highlighted. That is the question of automating the OC Promotion Evaluation System. Not only might it be labor saving but it is quite possible that budget constraints will eventually force the abandonment of the geographical area staffing structure which is essential to the panel system. The Task Force believes this issue should be given continuing attention in the context of the COMCON/E data base system for OC personnel. (U)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT: Task Force Report (U)

7. The Task Force wishes to express its appreciation, as individuals, for the opportunity to study this very important issue, and with this letter, goes on record as unanimously endorsing the recommendations contained in the report. (U)

25X1

Attachment:  
Task Force Report

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## PAGE

## I. SUMMARY

A. Executive Summary	1
B. Recommendations	2

## II. INTRODUCTION

A. Task Force Assignment	4
B. Focus	5
C. Methodology	6
D. System Goals	8

## III. PRESENT SYSTEM

A. History of OC Sub-system	10
B. Relation to Agency/DDA Policies	11

## IV. DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. General	12
B. Selection	
1. GS-13 Evaluation and Promotion	13
2. Sawtooth/Lock-in	16
3. Promotion to Basic Grade, Panels N & D	18
4. Temporary Promotions	20
C. Appraisal	
1. Criteria	21
2. Panel Selections	22
3. Panel Guidance	24
4. PAR	25
D. Related Issues	
1. Cost	26
2. Alphabetizing	28
3. Mobility	29
4. Seniority	33
5. Evaluation	39
6. Panel Structure	42
7. EEO	45
8. System Understanding	46
E. Automation	47

STAT

DRAFT APPENDICES

A. CEL/PAR Schedule	49
B. BYCELS-II Criteria	51
C. Preliminary Panel Rating Form	67
D. Characteristic Weights	68
E. Preliminary Panel Ranking Sheet	69
F. Consolidated Panel Ranking Sheet	70

I. SUMMARY

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Director of Communications appointed a task force in May 1979 to undertake a study and make recommendations for improving the OC process for performance evaluation, and selection for advancement. The present system, generally referred to as BYCELS, has been in existence since 1971. It has worked well over the years, has required occasional modification, and has produced qualified persons for promotion at each grade level. BYCELS has been reasonably well accepted. However, very substantial changes have occurred in Agency personnel management procedures during the past eight years, and there have been social and economic changes as well. All these many forces for change have impacted on the BYCELS system in the form of criticisms from both the work force and management. On the one hand there is a small but persistent element of complaint focusing on various perceived inequities from the workers standpoint. At the same time, there is a small but growing feeling on the part of management that the system is failing to produce new talent sufficient to replenish an aging work force and keep the institution viable through extended periods of change. It became quickly apparent to the Task Force that performance evaluation and selection for advancement are basically the outputs of the evaluation system and that any study of outputs would also have to involve an equivalent review of system inputs. For this reason, the Task Force looked into such additional areas as mobility, seniority, potential and various forms of selections. Selection in Task Force terms covered a range of ideas including selection for development, promotion and even separation. The reader is invited to keep in mind these various input considerations as the report is being read.

The Task Force consisted of five members and a special assistant. The membership represented a grade spread from GS-10 to SIS, an experience spread of more than 20 years and diverse panel backgrounds including O, E, D, S, and N.

I.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of the Task Force are summarized below with Section IV containing the complete discussion of each issue:

1. That the method of selecting personnel for promotion to GS-14 be modified to more effectively meet the needs of the Office.

2. That the proposed promotion lock-in feature be adopted to guarantee a fixed number of Panel D GS-10 promotions annually as a means of combating the "bridesmaid" sawtooth effect.

STAT

✓ 3. That [ ] be amended to provide more explicit guidance regarding promotions below the basic grade levels.

4. That the Support Services Division undertake a study concerning the feasibility of adopting a temporary promotion policy, or equivalent compensation mechanism, for personnel assigned to positions higher than their personal rank.

✓ 5. That the newly developed competitive evaluation criteria, with revised weighting, be adopted as a means to better serve managements needs and goals.

6. That the newly developed guidelines for selecting PCEL/CCEL panels be adopted as a means of providing continuity, understanding and acceptance through participation in the system.

STAT

✓ 7. That [ ] be amended to provide CCEL guidance on a regular basis in order to improve upon the quality of decisions made by these panels.

✓ 8. That the PAR be used as a primary input to the evaluation process as was the fitness report before it.

9. That the cost of the career management and evaluation system be reduced through better selection of panel participants, better preparation for panel meetings, improved panel discipline and tighter scheduling.

10. That OC return to the Rank Order Listing of all employees, vice alphabetizing the middle 65%, in order that management may fulfill their complete scope of responsibility to employees.

✓ 11. That employees be assessed as to their degree of mobility and that proposed sanctions or rewards be adopted.

✓ 12. That proposed guidelines be adopted for use by the Assignment Review Board, and other ad hoc groups, during their deliberations regarding employment retention issues related to mobility and performance factors.

✓ 13. That seniority or time-in-grade be factored into the experience and versatility criteria for individuals at the basic grade level.

✓ 14. That OC adopt the proposed procedures that grant preferential treatment to personnel GS-12 and below as a means of recognition and reward for long and faithful service.

✓ 15. That the opportunity for competitive evaluation counseling be offered to all employees on a voluntary basis except in cases of low individual standing which requires mandatory counseling.

✓ 16. That OMS/PSS or OTR be enlisted to help identify counseling courses aimed at educating OC managers and employees in the basic techniques of realistic goal setting and honest self-appraisal.

✓ 17. That career panel chiefs place emphasis on identifying employees with excellent potential for orderly development, and CSB develop qualification guidelines and an annual panel assignment plan that would promote development experience, promote equity and encourage career enhancing opportunities.

✓ 18. That newly developed BYCELS evaluation criteria be reviewed for any EEO-type bias.

✓ 19. That a combination of live briefings and media training aids be used to disseminate approved portions of this report and that CSB schedule periodic reviews of management policies and procedures for the purpose of timely changes and revisions.

✓ 20. That OC commit resources to further research and develop techniques for automating OC's competitive evaluation system.

## II. INTRODUCTION

### A. TASK FORCE ASSIGNMENT

From the outset the Task Force oriented its efforts towards a comprehensive review of promotion/selection as a total process. Promotion involves much more than a document called BYCELS, which is simply the short title appended to a list of weighted criteria used by the Office to comparatively rate performance. The promotion process involves the panel system itself, and the whole concept of mobility, seniority, potential and even eligibility for continued employment. More importantly, the promotion process is responsible for selecting the future leaders of the office.

The foregoing made it obvious that the Task Force had to begin its efforts as an unstructured process. The Director of Communications was the leading advocate of this approach by suggesting at the outset that the study should be as encompassing as possible and that no areas were off-limits. Consequently, the Task Force began its work by first agreeing that initial research should be directed towards deciding whether to endorse, replace or modify the present system.

## II. INTRODUCTION

### B. FOCUS

After reading extensively on the subject of personnel evaluation techniques, it became obvious that most systems attempt to measure an employee's job performance in isolation from the manner in which others perform the same tasks. Little attention is paid to comparative evaluation of large numbers of persons performing similar tasks. One must presume that most organizations are concerned with ensuring that employees selected for advancement are actually performing work at higher levels and that sufficient vacancies exist to reward those employees. Thus, the Task Force found little guidance and a very limited basis for comparing OC's existing comparative and competitive system with practices in use elsewhere in government or private industry.

With few comparable systems to study, the Task Force proceeded with a discussion of the existing system in the context of documented complaints and registered suggestions for improvements. Several factors soon became apparent. There is no perfect system for judging the performance of human beings. As suggestions were analyzed, it became obvious that they could be grouped into not more than four categories and that within these categories, they were often countervailing. Suggestions were mostly oriented towards solving a particular problem or group of problems such as how to acknowledge years of experience, how to recognize and develop potential, how to penalize for limited value, etc. From the management viewpoint, there is pressure to identify and promote the "ideal" person, i.e., the person who will make the best manager, the person who best replicates the managerial characteristics of the one making the selection, the person who can function best to ensure survival of the institution, etc. While the compilation of suggestions and ideas constituted an argument for modifying the present system, they were totally unconvincing that the system itself is fatally flawed or that it should be scrubbed.

The Task Force early in its discussions determined that the present system for evaluation and selection in OC is essentially sound. There is a need to modify certain aspects of the system to enhance proper managerial selection, to improve career development opportunities, and to weed out marginal performers. With this decision in hand, the Task Force bent its efforts towards modifying and enhancing the existing OC system.

### C. METHODOLOGY

Literature. From approximately May until the Task Force began meeting in September individual members researched and compiled various reference material dealing with the issue of performance evaluation and promotion. The single most important thing gleaned from the literature was the indication that private industry and academia have concentrated on performance measurement on the job in the context of productivity and efficiency by working on the assumption that having met the criteria the individual could be promoted or otherwise enjoy a salary increase. The literature examined was noticeably lacking in discussions of competitive selection for advancement into supervisory and managerial ranks where-in the number of upward mobility opportunities were fewer than the number of candidates. In comparing this literature with the OC competitive performance measurement and promotion process, it was found to deal primarily with the issue of promotion from EOD to basic grade level and not with competitive performance and promotion above basic grade level.

Consultations. The Task Force consulted with the Deputy Director of Personnel for Plans & Control on two occasions during the course of its work. The Task Force also consulted with the Office of Medical Services, Psychological Services Staff.

Interviews. The Task Force became aware of the difficulty experienced by the OC Senior Staff during the 1979 GS-13 "Super-CCEL" meetings. The difficulties apparently stemmed from their feeling that the preliminary evaluation panels are failing to select the best people as candidates for progression to senior officer status. It occurred to the Task Force that it might benefit from discussions with members of the panel. Discussions with the individual OC Senior Staff members constituted an extremely important area of research for the Task Force in that it revealed the wide variation in perceptions among the OC Senior Officers as to the form and substance of the OC appraisal and selection system. The issues raised in these discussions had a profound effect on the outcome of this study, particularly in the areas of GS-13 evaluations and in the revisions to the evaluation criteria.

Employee Suggestions. The fourth area of research was the solicitation by way of an OC notice of suggestions from employees in the OC Career Sub-group System for ideas and thoughts for improvements. A number of suggestions were received; each was individually acknowledged. Many contained thoughtful, constructive ideas. Most dealt with particular aspects of the present system and suggested improvements which did not take into account the impact such suggestions would have on the total system. Suggestions concentrated on three or four main topics including the performance evaluation process, seniority as a promotion factor, mobility and various views on the PCEL/CCEL structure. Very few of the suggestions have been incorporated directly as presented. However, each received serious consideration and many, in one way or another, have been incorporated into the report.

Analysis of Complaints. The fifth major area of research was a study and review of the most common complaints about the present system. Complaints in essence are very closely related to suggestions for improvements. They are the other side of the same coin. Those particular aspects of our system which cause the most pain seem to be in the area of mobility in an aging work force and lack of seniority consideration. The Task Force found the complaint process to be a useful source of data.

## II. INTRODUCTION

### D. SYSTEM GOALS

The Task Force selected seven primary objectives as outcomes of its efforts.

1. TO IDENTIFY AND RANK OC EMPLOYEES FOR RETENTION, SEPARATION, DEVELOPMENT AND PROMOTION. The present BYCELS system identifies individuals for rank order promotion, and to some extent, attempts to place a value on the individual's potential for development. However, the present system does not adequately identify employees who should be selected for long term managerial training and development. Agency regulations are relatively specific in terms of identifying performance problems and low rank order listings for remedial action and/or separation. Yet, the criteria which places a person at the bottom of the list are somewhat ambiguous and appearance on that list, except in rare cases, does not precipitate separation. The Task Force has sought to make the separation process more straight forward. Another area of concern to the Task Force is the need to more accurately identify persons for retention. It is difficult to distinguish between retention and separation as concepts. However, there are relatively large numbers of people who are doing satisfactory work on a day-to-day basis who for one reason or another lack mobility and/or developmental potential, yet who by virtue of time in position rise into the promotion zone. The Task Force has sought to establish a mechanism to preclude this type of longevity progression.

2. TO DEVELOP A SELECTION AND RANKING SYSTEM ACCEPTABLE TO BOTH MANAGEMENT AND EMPLOYEES. Any system that is developed must be perceived as fair and equitable by the employees, be responsive to mission needs and be in consonance with published management policy. It should leave little room for misinterpretation and must avoid any hint of unpublished, undocumented (secret) practices. The system should be able to withstand scrutiny, be subject to review, and be adaptable to change in response to constructive criticism.

3. TO ENLIST MAXIMUM EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND OPERATION OF THE PROMOTION SYSTEM. Broad participation by the individuals subjected to the process will generate a better understanding of the system and help to reinforce the belief that the system functions openly and fairly. The present BYCELS process meets this need. With formal employee participation at all levels of performance appraisal and selection, it is believed that a maximum degree of support for the OC career management system will be maintained.

4. TO DEVELOP A SYSTEM WITH BROAD APPLICABILITY IN OC.  
To be widely accepted the OC personnel evaluation process must be applicable to the entire OC population with few, if any, exceptions. Perceptions of special treatment or suggestions of elitism must be judiciously avoided. However, within a common system, consideration may be given to variable criteria or to variations in criteria weights depending upon the grades or panels of the employees being evaluated.

5. TO PROVIDE A SYSTEM THAT OFFERS TIMELY AND STRUCTURED FEEDBACK. A formal means of developing and offering feedback information should be built into the evaluation system. Since feedback can be expected to either reenforce or modify behavior, training in effective counselling is desirable.

6. TO ADDRESS THE SENIORITY ISSUE. Based on employee suggestions and complaints, the significance of seniority as a factor in a competitive promotion system must be addressed. Care must be taken in dealing with this issue as over emphasis may produce undesired results.

7. TO BE FULLY RESPONSIVE TO THE PRECEPTS OF EEO. Equal employment opportunity is a requirement of law and is a matter of Agency and OC policy. The OC promotion selection system must be developed in consonance with EEO requirements.

### III. PRESENT SYSTEM

#### A. History of OC Sub-system

Almost from the very beginning, the Office of Communications has followed the policy and practice of awarding promotions to its most qualified people. Selection has traditionally involved a system of comparative evaluation. Between the early 1950's and the late 1960's a number of methods were tried. Early on, it became apparent that employees could best be evaluated if grouped according to areas of skill, expertise, or profession. These are later known as panels. As different groupings were experimented with, it became evident that a method of measuring was required. Various adjectival and weighted numerical schemes were tried; most were found to be responsive to individual group needs. By the late 1960's, sufficient experience had been gained with comparative evaluation to suggest that the best candidates for promotion were, in fact, being selected. It also became apparent that manpower and cost economy and reliability in selection could best be obtained by using a common system for selection across all panels. By the early 1970's such a system had evolved and had become commonly known as BYCELS. The experience with BYCELS during the past several years suggested a high degree of success in achieving fairness and accuracy in promotion selection. The number of criteria used in the measurement process has varied; some definitions have changed; but basically the system has remained in pretty much its original form.

Until the mid-1970's, the Office of Communications had its own career service. Based on higher level decision it was determined that the Agency had too many independent career services, a decision was made to combine and reduce the total number. The DDA was designated as one career service with each office and major component within the Directorate constituting a career sub-group.

### III.

#### B. Relation to Agency/DDA Policies

The process of comparative evaluation for promotion selection is embodied in Agency regulations. The OC system is in compliance with that policy. The DDA career service is formalized and provides the overall basis for OC career sub-group practices, procedures, and philosophies. At the same time the OC sub-group operates with a considerable degree of latitude and flexibility.

The panel system is also embodied in Agency policy. With the advent of the Agency-wide panel system, the Office of Communications found itself to be in a premier position in that its panel system had been long established and required very little adjustment to be in consonance with the new career service organization. More recently with the advent of the Uniform Promotion System (UPS), the Office of Communications again found itself to be in keeping with the reaffirmation of the panel system but was unable to develop a promotion schedule following the DDA grade profile. As a result, the Office of Communications was authorized to develop its own promotion model. This has been done and the Office has been successful in meeting its promotion commitments to date.

#### IV. DISCUSSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

##### A. General

It is axiomatic that any policy, procedure, or system, to be effective, must have the full support of management and the general acceptance of employees. This is particularly true of a personnel appraisal and selection system.

From management's perspective, the system must identify, on a regular basis, those best suited and qualified for advancement. From the perspective of employees, the system should reward high quality performance fairly and objectively.

Our experience, particularly over the last eight years or so, indicates that a system acceptable to all elements in an organization is one which:

- (1) Identifies the right people for advancement, assignment, training, and retention or separation.
- (2) Is fair and objective.
- (3) Employs standard evaluation criteria and procedures.
- (4) Includes widespread employee participation.
- (5) Is economical to administer.
- (6) Has broad, if not universal, application within OC.
- (7) Is fully documented and non-secretive.
- (8) Provides the means for recognizing and rewarding achievement.

Each of the issues raised in the balance of this study were addressed with these eight specific points in mind.

#### IV. B. SELECTION

##### 1. GS-13 Evaluation and Promotion.

###### Discussion

We became convinced early on that the method of selecting personnel for promotion to GS-14 needed to be scrutinized in consideration of the importance of these promotions to the long term effectiveness of the office, and the acknowledgement that the "super" CCEL has experienced serious difficulty in working with the individual listings CCEL presented to them by the Career Panels. The Task Force addressed the issue by interviewing each of the GS-17 officers comprising the "super" CCEL panel.

Two general concepts for eliminating some of the perceived difficulties emerged from the interviews: removing most or all GS-14 positions from Panel O and allocating them to the various career panels, or devising a method of improving the evaluation and selection process at the GS-13 level.

The former approach had some rather strong backing. It was felt that if panel chiefs controlled their GS-14 positions this would ensure technical/operational competence at this level in the organization and, moreover, would be a way of rewarding the "specialist."

Although this approach has its attractions, the Task Force concluded that it really just kicks the problem upstairs, i.e., the super CCEL would be working with GS-14 career panel CCEL's rather than GS-13 CCEL's and, except that they would be dealing with fewer numbers, would still be looking at lists which would probably be top-heavy with experienced specialists who may not have the attributes deemed essential (by the super CCEL) for success at the GS-15 level and beyond.

This approach would continue to foster career panel barriers by raising them to the GS-14 level. It would also pose the problem of allocating the GS-14 positions. For example, would any go to Panels N and I?

The Task Force turned next to looking at an approach which would tend to lower career panel barriers and simultaneously get major component chiefs more involved in the evaluation and selection process from the very beginning. In other words, we looked for a way to make them accountable for the first cut at comparatively evaluating their assigned GS-13's, regardless of panel affiliation. Investigating this approach further, it became clear that we could evolve a process which would hold the major component

chiefs and the Career Sub-group Board (a.k.a. Career Panel Chiefs) jointly accountable for the quality of the candidates proposed for promotion to GS-14. And, because Chief, Panel O and, ultimately, the D/CO are accountable for the effectiveness of the office, their need and right to be involved was also evident.

The proposed procedure is economical in that it requires no additional support mechanisms or resource time. The career panel chiefs would continue to assign, train and counsel their GS-13's. Component chiefs would continue to PCEL GS-13's but under the proposed procedure would do them all at the same time. The time which would be spent by the CSB would be off set by the time saved at the career panel level.

Career panel chiefs would also benefit from the direct feedback they will receive in the CCEL process. The feedback will permit them to take immediate remedial action (e.g., reassignment, rotational assignment, skill training, counseling, etc.) if such is indicated as a result of CCEL deliberations and assessments. Moreover, it keeps them directly involved in the competitive evaluation process, thus CSB decisions on matters relating to competitive evaluation and promotion would benefit from this first hand knowledge. We would also expect more cross panel assignments at the GS-13 level to flow from this experience. This, in turn, should lead to having a "better look" on GS-13's at the time they are under consideration for promotion to GS-14.

By competitively evaluating GS-13's at the component level would we create unhealthy competition on Area and Division staffs? Our assessment is no. This is based on observing others who find themselves in similar situations (e.g., GS-12 watch officers, GS-11 instructors, or GS-09's at the signal center, etc.). Conversely, it could foster increased effectiveness and productivity. For example, is a COMSEC officer at an Area headquarters as concerned as he might be about his performance considering he knows he will be ranked one-out-of-one on his Area's PCEL? Perhaps not.

Lastly, we believe there is a paramount need to replenish Panel O, that is, on balance, it is more important to have most of the positions filled with people of the appropriate grade than to have lower graded people in the positions (primarily because agreement cannot be reached on whom to promote). To offset this perceived problem we concluded that the CSB, which will take the initial cut at producing the GS-14 promotion list, should employ a stated criteria which, in the first instance, was approved by the D/CO. Secondly, we believe that this criteria should be applied in conjunction with the philosophy that the CSB is not looking for those with the potential to be successful at the GS-16

level but rather at the GS-14 and GS-15 level. This is partly in recognition of the fact that we need good Branch Chiefs regardless of whether or not they might ever get to be Division Chiefs, and partly because there are four times as many GS-14 positions as GS-16 positions and, therefore, only one out of every four is likely to make GS-16 anyway.

Since replenishment is paramount, we conclude that it is logical and proper to permit Chief, Panel O and/or the D/CO to adjust the final order-of-rank so as to ensure that not only the right people are getting promoted, but the right number and mix of people.

### Recommendations

- ① That, annually, each major OC component (i.e., areas and divisions) convene a panel to competitively evaluate and rank (PCEL) all GS-13's assigned to that component regardless of Career Panel affiliation. The standard evaluation criteria (BYCELS) will be used to derive the PCEL.
- ② That the Career Sub-group Board be responsible for consolidating these PCEL's to produce a CCEL.
- ③ That the completed CCEL be forwarded to Chief, Panel O for further review, and to the D/CO for final review and approval. In recognition of the importance of promotions to GS-14, Chief, Panel O's review may include the option of either reconvening the CSB with himself present for further discussions, or independently changing the order of rank of the CCEL in order to ensure that the ranks of the senior officers are filled with a proper mix of skills and experience. In the latter case, both the original CCEL and the revised CCEL will be made part of the official record.
- ④ That annually (November/December), the CSB be required to meet to effect cross-panel assignments at the GS-13 and GS-12 levels. Primary consideration will be given to those candidates at the GS-13 level whose effectiveness and promotability would be enhanced by such an experience.

## IV. B.

## 2. SAWTOOTHING/LOCK-IN

Discussion

Sawtoothing is likely to occur each time an employee moves into a new job and especially if the new job takes him or her into a new Division or area. The general effect of sawtoothing is to place the employee within the "average" group because the evaluators lack good, first-hand knowledge of the performance of the employee.

Sawtoothing, then, when it occurs - and to the degree it occurs - is the inevitable result of the Office's rotational assignment policy. Therefore, in one sense, it is a fact of employment, and all employees are affected to varying degrees, depending on the frequency of rotation within the panel at the grade.

Some measures that have been taken in the past to lessen the effects of sawtoothing include lateral transfers within the same Area and extensions of tour length. The principle here is that persons are better able to establish their credentials (their worth to the Organization) the longer they stay in one place. The effects are lessened also by sending biographic data and recent fitness reports to the gaining component.

In spite of these efforts to lessen the effects, there appears to be general agreement that something more must be done for GS-9's in Panel D. In other words, because of the sheer number of these employees (who are competing for so relatively few promotions each year), and their more frequent rotation, they are, as a group, more susceptible to the adverse effects of sawtoothing.

The foregoing discusses sawtoothing as it affects the specific standing of an employee on the CCEL list. Another aspect of sawtooth is the variation in the number of promotions made from year to year. In this context, an employee who earns the 40th position on the list (as in 1978) would be promoted whereas an employee who earned position 19 (as in 1976) in a lean year would not. Just as forwarding past performance data to a gaining area helps to level performance sawtoothing, the lock-in suggestion for establishing a smoothed promotion rate from year to year can work to level promotion sawtoothing. Therefore, we reviewed the proposal to lock-in Panel D GS-9's for promotion to GS-10. The original (1976) proposal called for locking-in the top 20 GS-9's annually and guaranteeing them

promotion to GS-10 if not that year, then when headroom became available. A review of GS-9 promotions since 1972 reveals that we could have locked-in 25 annually without mortgaging headroom. Going further than the 1976 proposal, we feel that the lock-in system should guarantee a minimum number of promotions annually.

#### RECOMMENDATION

- That the lock-in method be adopted for GS-9 Panel D personnel at an annual level, determined by averaging actual headroom of the previous five years. Shortfalls in headroom will be mortgaged against future year's vacancies.
- That an initial level of 20 promotions per year be adopted to provide a smoothed annual promotion experience.
- That Chief, Panel D be required to project and fix the lock-in figure at least one year in advance.

## IV. B.

## 3. Promotion to the Basic Grade in Panels N &amp; D

Discussion

It is generally held that some type of "spacing" is necessary to ensure that Panel D & N EOD personnel are adequately trained and reasonably experienced to do basic grade-level work before promotion to the basic grade level. All things considered, time-in-grade is believed to be a good general guideline for measuring experience.

STAT

We recently recognized this need and published [redacted] The notice has gone a long way in providing guidance to employees and managers on this issue and is in consonance with the Uniform Promotion System. Unfortunately, the notice is being liberally interpreted by some managers and conservatively by others resulting in inequities to some employees.

STAT

The Notice basically keys promotion of [redacted] graduate to the UPS schedule and establishes minimum spacing guidelines. We find, however, that some employees are being routinely submitted for promotion in less than six months from their date-of-grade while others are not being recommended until 18 months has elapsed.

The interpretation problem appears to be centered on the word "within" in the sentence: "Each employee at the GS-03 level will be reviewed in accordance with the UPS schedule on an annual basis, and may normally be expected to achieve the skills level justifying a promotion recommendation within 18 months from the date of grade....." We believe a change in wording will provide more explicit guidance, eliminate inequities, and at the same time allow for unimpeded progress for the truly exceptional individual.

Recommendation

STAT

0 That [redacted] be amended to read:  
 "Promotion to the Basic Grade Level: The basic grade level is established on the principal that OC employees are required to master a collection of skills and demonstrate performance proficiency. This demonstration of ability will normally occur after acquiring considerable on-the-job experience on their first tour of duty. Although each employee will be reviewed on an annual basis in accordance with the UPS schedule, we would not normally anticipate employees in this category acquiring the professional skills justifying a promotion recommendation to the basic grade earlier than 18 months from

their date of grade. Once an employee's performance matches the requirements of the basic grade, at the 18 month time frame (or earlier if exceptional performance is clearly demonstrated and documented) a supervisor fitness report and component promotion recommendation will be submitted to the cognizant panel chief. Promotion actions will be processed in accordance with the Uniform Promotion Schedule (UPS)."

IV. B.

4. Temporary Promotions.

Discussion

Often, we must, for a variety of compelling reasons, assign our personnel to positions one grade higher than their personal rank for periods of one or more years. Other than the professional challenges to the incumbents and the higher visibility which might occur, no formal compensation or recognition accrues. Among others, the Inspector General (in 1977) suggested that we look at methods to reward these employees.

To automatically promote employees assigned to higher graded positions would be detrimental to the Office's career management system. Such a procedure is simply incompatible with a competitive evaluation system.

Yet, because we ask and expect these people to accept more responsibility, we should offer something concrete in return. Of all the options we discussed (and there aren't many), temporary promotion appears to be the most promising. As an example, six months after they are in the higher graded position and performing well, the temporary promotion would be made with the following stipulations:

- a. Revert to permanent grade no later than six months after vacating the position.
- b. Could not exceed one year or the length of the tour whichever is greater.
- c. Could not be temporarily promoted on two consecutive tours.

Recommendation

● That the Staff Support Division study and report on the feasibility and ramifications of instituting a temporary promotion policy in the Office of Communications for all personnel through grade GS-12 as the preferred method of recognizing and rewarding this type of service.

● That, alternatively, if temporary promotions are not feasible, equivalent compensation be accorded through the Special Achievement Awards mechanism.

#### IV. C. APPRAISAL

##### 1. Criteria

##### Discussion

Very early in the review of our current system, we examined the need and effectiveness of our world-wide rank order list (CCEL) and its attendant standard evaluation criteria (BYCELS). Among the factors considered during the review were:

- The Agency requirement to promote from a rank order list.
- The OC policy of also using the rank order list for assignment, training, counseling, and retention determination purposes.
- The general acceptance of the current system by management and employees.

Additionally, other personnel evaluation systems were discussed and compared with our system. From our viewpoint, none of the others compared favorably considering the large number of widely dispersed people we have to evaluate and rank. Admittedly, some systems in the final analysis might produce similar results, but none in our opinion would be more acceptable to our employees. As an example, a protege system might produce similar results but would never pass anyone's "Fair and objective" test.

Given that our two-tiered PCEL/CCEL system is effective and acceptable, we turned to examining the BYCELS criteria itself in order to determine if the same level of confidence pertained to it as pertained to the overall system. After reviewing suggestions for changing the criteria, debriefing senior officers on the subject and reviewing statistics developed from BYCELS scoring, we agreed that we should be able to improve the precision of the PCEL process by modifying BYCELS.

The Task Force spent many hours developing a modified list of criteria and system of weighting which it believes will be equally accurate, offers a more logical grouping of criteria, will be less time consuming to use and will allow higher potential employees in all panels to be identified.

##### Recommendation

0 That the modified competitive evaluation criteria, BYCELS II (see draft Annex A ), be adopted.

STAT

IV. C.

2. Panel Selections

Discussion

In selecting people to serve on PCEL/CCEL panels, we acknowledged the benefits which flow from office-wide participation in the process. We also recognized the need to assemble groups that would best serve management goals. Therefore, panels should continue to be made up of personnel with differing viewpoints and experiences to provide understanding, acceptance and continuity through participation.

Recommendation

- That the following guidelines for selecting evaluation panels be published in the OC Personnel Management Handbook:

A. CCEL:

(1) Chairperson:

- (a) Selected by the panel chief.
- (b) At least two grades but not more than three grades higher than personnel being evaluated.
- (c) Previously served on a CCEL panel.
- (d) May not have served on the PCEL for the same grade level the same year.

(2) Members:

- (a) Members are chosen by the chairperson and approved by panel chief.
- (b) Five to seven members.
- (c) At least one but not more than two grades higher than personnel being evaluated.
- (d) Majority of panel members two grades higher than personnel being rated.
- (e) One member should be from a different panel/job discipline.
- (f) Members should have served on a PCEL panel.
- (g) May not have served on the PCEL for the same grade level during the same rating year.
- (h) There should be no supervisor/subordinate relationship among panel members.

B. PCEL:

- (1) Chairperson.
  - (a) Selected by component chief.
  - (b) Two grades higher than employees being rated.
  - (c) Should have prior evaluation panel experience.
- (2) Members:
  - (a) Should be at least one and preferably two grades higher than personnel being rated.
  - (b) Majority should be two grades higher than personnel being rated.
  - (c) One member should be from a different job discipline.
  - (d) Members are selected by the chairperson and approved by the component chief.

C. GS-13 CCEL

- (1) Chairperson - Chief, CSB
- (2) Members - CSB members.

D. GS-13 PCEL

- (1) Chairperson - Component chief.
- (2) Members - GS-14's or above

IV. C.

3. Guidance for CCEL Panels

Discussion

The PCEL process attempts to accurately evaluate each employee against a set of objective criteria. The result is a ranking based on numerical values assigned to each criterion.

The CCEL process, on the other hand, is one in which employees who ranked highest in the PCEL process are comparatively evaluated to determine who will be number one among ones, etc. This process is conducted without a published set of criteria.

The quality of the decisions made by CCEL panels should be improved by providing guidance to CCEL panels on a regular basis. The guidance could include a review of Strategic Plan personnel management objectives, Panel Chief observations on panel needs vis-a-vis office requirements, and like information. However, since there is no published CCEL rating criteria per se, we feel it would be time well spent if the panels, prior to starting the comparison process, reached a consensus on the performance and personal characteristics they are looking for at the next higher grade level. It seems to us that unanimity among panel members is important so that judgments will be consistent and better understood.

The most obvious and perhaps the fairest approach to conducting CCEL panels is to use the PCEL weighting scheme as the major guide at each grade level. Simply stated, all other things being equal, the person judged best overall in the highest weighted characteristics would place first. These judgments, of course, would be made by the CCEL panel based on all available evidence, and would not be made on the basis of who had the highest PCEL scores in these criteria. Admittedly, the process would be much more complex than just described, yet the panel at least would be operating from a common base.

Recommendation

● That  be amended to read: "CCEL panels, before convening, will consult with the Panel Chief to receive guidance in conducting comparative evaluations. This guidance may include a review of the OC Strategic Plan, and other component objectives with emphasis on that research which would reveal the kind of communicator, engineer, or manager needed to meet today's requirements and the challenges of the future. Moreover, CCEL panels should give serious consideration and weight to ranking highest those with substantiated high performance in high-weighted BYCELS characteristics."

STAT

IV. C.

4. Use of Performance Appraisal Report (PAR) in  
Performance Evaluation

Discussion

The Task Force considered various approaches to incorporating PAR ratings directly into the performance evaluation criteria. Several schemes appeared to have merit but each foundered on the problem of incorporating or melding collective judgments (PCEL panel) with individual judgments (PAR rating officer) at the same level in the process. Because the PAR uses numerical ratings, it was tempting to at least try to incorporate them somehow but, we concluded that the PAR is merely the replacement for the fitness report and should be treated accordingly.

Recommendation

- That the PAR be used (as the fitness report before it was) as a primary input to the evaluation process.

## IV. D. RELATED ISSUES

## 1. COST

Discussion

The Task Force encountered concern among some officers that too much time is being spent on career management, and, in particular, on competitive evaluation. This feeling manifests itself in many ways, but generally reflects the thinking that time spent on "things" is better than time spent on people. For example, there seems to be a greater reluctance to release people for PCEL/CCEL panel duty compared to releasing people for planning conferences, budget meetings, training, and the like.

As this issue was being investigated, it became apparent to the Task Force that Agency regulations and policies require the regular commitment of resources to the operation of the Performance Appraisal System and the use of a panel system for producing an annual or semi-annual rank-order personnel selection and promotion listing. A study of the OC system for the NAPA report showed that the OC system cost approximately 8 - 10 hours per OC person per year, and approximately \$20 per person per year in travel cost. One major factor in this relatively low per person cost is the practice of having only one evaluation cycle annually.

Two new approaches to cutting costs were discussed at some length:

(1) Automate the PCEL process. The PCEL forms, under this approach, would be mailed to three or more supervisors, e.g., the person's Communications Officer, Chief of Station, and Area Operations Officer, and perhaps a professional peer and/or subordinate. The results would be collated at Headquarters by a computer and PCEL lists would be derived for CCEL use.

(2) Automate the CCEL process by arraying all competitors by PCEL score, and/or PCEL score and descriptor, and then convene a panel to check for anomalies and validate the results.

The interesting thing about both suggested approaches is the perception that they would take almost as much time while being much more susceptible to manipulation. Nonetheless, automating or streamlining the PCEL process is a primary concern especially since we may be forced away from the Area Headquarters management concept which contributes so much to the success of the present system.

The great advantage of the present system is that it not only works well but that it is also widely accepted. Therefore, our first and main effort at cutting costs should in our opinion focus on operating the system more efficiently rather than changing it drastically. This effort would be in addition to developing a PCEL criteria which would facilitate arriving at judgments more easily and therefore move quickly.

OC's career management and competitive evaluation system is expensive. We feel that some efficiencies can be realized through modifying the current process and tightening procedures. Moreover, we should move with deliberation into ways to enhance quality and reduce time through automation. In the final analysis, however, we must guard against saving time in the short run which in the long run could cause serious morale problems.

Recommendation:

● That time and therefore money be saved through:

- (1) Better selection of chairpersons and panel members (the better the knowledge and teamwork, the quicker (( and better)) the results).
- (2) Better preparation for panel meetings (biographic data, performance appraisals, collateral information).
- (3) Improved panel (conference) discipline and tighter scheduling.

IV.

D.

## 2. Alphabetizing CCEL's

### Discussion

While the NAPA report looked favorably upon alphabetizing the middle of rank order listings, we believe that the report failed to recognize and address all pertinent information before making their determination. The NAPA report focused on promotion, bottom 3%, and career counseling as the primary purpose of a rank order listing whereas OC also uses the rank order listing as a primary tool for determining assignments and training.

While we tend to agree with the report's conclusion that OC's evaluation process is time consuming, the implication is that it is too time consuming and with that we disagree. Moreover, we do not agree that alphabetizing of the middle 65% will significantly reduce the time spent on the process. An HRD study of the 1978 CCEL process involving Panels D and N indicated that less than 10% of the CCEL panel time was devoted to ranking the middle 65%. We feel the incremental amount of time consumed in complete ranking is a small price to pay for being able to track these employees more closely and, perhaps more importantly, to be able to say to our employees we are willing to take a good look at your performance record at least once a year. Moreover, we became convinced that alphabetizing as applied within the OC Career Sub-group is discriminatory because it is selectively applied to some grades and panels and not to others.

We did discuss other alternatives and of the alternatives reviewed, two were considered at some length, namely, (1) rank order list by time-in-grade, or (2) rank order list by PCEL numerical scores. We concluded, however, that these alternatives, although a little better than alphabetizing, still fall far short of what has worked well for OC in the past and what our employees expect of us.

### Recommendation

- That we return to the rank ordering listing of all employees as part of the CCEL process.

## IV. D

## 3. Mobility

Discussion

Mobility, sometimes referred to as assignability, is a major area of concern for employees and management alike. Management's primary concern is the number of long-term immobiles in the organization, and the degree to which these numbers adversely affect the office's rotational assignment system which, in turn, affects the flexibility and effectiveness of the Office. Employees are concerned either about career progress being impeded by their immobility status, or about having to do more than their fair share of overseas service without adequate recognition and compensation. In fact, some in the latter group also see their competitive position weakened by being stationed so far away from the flagpole for so many years.

Immobility, we found, was the most difficult issue we had to deal with and, if anything, got more complex as we dug deeper into the issue. To start with is the difficulty we encountered defining the term itself. The immobility definition adopted by the Task Force reads: "Employees who, within the rating period, fail to successfully complete an overseas or domestic field assignment (for cause), or who refuse an appropriate assignment or who cannot acquire the medical, legal, or security clearances required of themselves or their family."

Secondly, we were quite aware that we were attempting to formulate a relatively static policy and apply it to constantly changing circumstances in the life and career of an employee. To wit:

- Employee EOD
- Directed rotational assignments occur (overseas and domestic).
- Employee's marital status changes.
- Employee acquires dependents.
- Increasing family considerations including school age children.
- Medical problems increase with family age and size.
- Perception of overseas benefits change (real or imagined).

- Employee acquires need for "roots" as family ages and career goals stabilize.
- "Roots" deepen to the point where employee may have to make a decision between career and family.
- Employee's career goals may change.
- Conflict with the needs-of-the service may occur.

Two general approaches to dealing with the issue were reviewed, namely, penalties or sanctions for immobility (the stick approach), and rewards for mobility (the carrot approach).

If sanctions are applied on the basis of our definition; for example, if promotions are withheld on immobiles, how then could we consistently apply such sanctions in the face of incomplete or inaccurate knowledge of employee mobility. For instance, unbeknownst to management how many might be planning to refuse or won't qualify the next time around? How many will requalify or will change their attitude because of changes in their personal situation?

If sanctions are applied, should they be applied to differing degrees depending upon the category of immobility (e.g., overseas with restrictions, domestic, or domestic with restrictions) and/or whether or not the immobility is self-imposed? And, shouldn't sanctions be tempered by the employee's record of past contributions and service?

Turn for a moment to the carrot approach. Could we make mobility so attractive in terms of benefits and rewards which would accrue to those who "would go anywhere at anytime" that the majority of the "hell no, I won't go" group will once again declare themselves mobile? Although the sanction questions are much more difficult to answer, we judged that we have few real "carrots" to offer that would substantially improve our present level of mobility.

We investigated the possibility, for instance, of enhancing an employee's competitive standing for promotion, of providing bonuses for an accumulation of overseas time, and of providing other forms of preferential treatment. Generally, we concluded that "carrots and sticks" should be employed only if guidelines can be developed to ensure consistency in applying them. (See Section IV. D.4 following.)

Turning to immobility as a factor of promotability, we confirmed in our own minds that the decision made some years ago to remove "assignability" from the BYCELS criteria was a wise one. PCEL panels simply do not have the type of information needed to make such judgments. Yet, we believe the judgment

must be made as to whether an immobile person should be promoted, and the CCEL panel logically is in the best position to make this determination.

At a minimum, CCEL panels would require the following information as a basis for removing an immobile person from the promotion eligibility list.

- (1) Category of immobility, i.e., overseas with restrictions, domestic, domestic with restrictions.
- (2) Reason for immobility, i.e., self-imposed, medical, dependent medical, etc.
- (3) Duration of immobility, i.e., permanent, three years, unknown, etc.
- (4) Employee statement regarding immobility.
- (5) Applicable sensitive personnel information.
- (6) Complete biographic and performance data including prior mobility record.

We do feel that it is important to get a periodic statement from those employees who by definition are immobile. These individuals would be asked to respond to the following statement:

"Mobility is a condition for continued employment in OC. It is also a factor which could affect your promotability. Therefore, we need to know of your willingness to serve where and when assigned." Response:

"I consider myself available and willing to accept an assignment

/ / Without restriction

/ / With restrictions described below"

This employee statement, we are confident, will go far towards ensuring that the facts available for consideration include not only management derived information, but an official and recent record of how the employee feels on the matter.

Recommendations:

- That the foregoing Task Force definition of mobility be adopted for use by CCEL panels, the Assignment Review Board, and other reviewing authorities.

- That a statement of mobility be required of employees who by definition are considered immobile.
- That the benefits for seniority as discussed in IV. D.4 also be viewed as incentives for sustained mobility.
- That employee immobility be a cause for by-passing or withholding promotion as determined by CCEL panels and approved by the Chief of the OC Career Sub-Group on a case-by-case basis.
- That these recommendations generally apply to Panels D, N S, E, and O and to others as determined periodically by the CSB.
- That any employee found ineligible for promotion for reasons of immobility be advised in writing and be routinely scheduled for an ARB review.

IV. D.

4. Seniority

a. Retention

Discussion

Occasionally, there are times when an employee's suitability for retention as an OC careerist is reviewed. This review is clearly critical in that a person's livelihood is at stake, along with the effectiveness of the office and its credibility and consistency in handling such sensitive issues. Therefore, guidelines should be established and published so that all concerned in the review process know where they stand.

Although immobility is far and away the main reason employees are reviewed for retention, performance and security clearance problems are also important reasons.

Of all the factors discussed for use in developing retention guidelines, seniority emerged as the one factor that could be best used to develop retention guidelines which would be acceptable to both management and employees. It is also the one that best accounts for the employees contribution and commitment, and the office's investment.

Recommendation

- That, within the framework of the Organization policy of non-tenured service, the following guidelines be adopted for use of the Assignment Review Board and other ad hoc groups which meet to consider employee retention issues related to mobility and performance:

CONDITIONS OF SERVICE	YEARS OF SERVICE		
	3 - 10	11 - 20	Over 21
1. MOBILITY			
A. Won't go	Out	Downgrade/3-years and out.	No Promotion - Out at age 50
B. Can't go	18 mos. & out	3 Years and out	Out at age 50
PERFORMANCE			
A. LP	Probation	Probation/Downgrade	No Promotion - Out at age 50
B. SS	Out	Out	Downgrade - Out at age 50

- That years-of-service be a prime consideration in any retention decision involving security considerations. Particularly, those with 20 years-of-service with security clearance problems should be looked on favorably for placement elsewhere in the Organization in a less sensitive position.

## IV. D.

## 4. Seniority

## b. Competitive Evaluation

Discussion

For the purposes of this discussion we define seniority and longevity as total Agency service, and time-in-grade as just that, time-in-grade.

Human resource management in OC has historically been concerned with the seniority question especially as it relates to promotion. Since the early 60's, schemes have been put forward and studied for the purpose of somehow incorporating a seniority or a time-in-grade factor into the competitive evaluation process. This was attempted in spite of the knowledge that competitive evaluation systems and systems based on seniority are basically incompatible.

It is useful also to note that although the seniority issue has been around a long time, it only appears to be a problem in two or three panels at the basic grade level. And, furthermore, considering the size of the population affected (Panel D alone has over [ ] at this grade level), the actual number of suggestions to incorporate a time-in-grade factor have been few, strongly suggesting that it is a non-problem.

STAT The heart of the matter, we concluded, rested on two observations. First, if we went to a straight seniority system for promotion to the next grade above basic grade, then it would take such a person in Panel D between twelve and fourteen years to get promoted depending upon the annual promotion rate and attrition at the basic level. Second, if a portion of the headroom at the next grade above the basic grade level is set aside for those identified for a non-competitive time-in-grade promotion, we expect that no one would be satisfied. The young, highly competitive middle group would see nothing in it for them; and the time-in-graders should not be expected to be overjoyed at receiving such a promotion and, in fact, might be downright embarrassed.

Various other procedures were discussed which were attempts at indirectly affecting promotion ranking. The first and most obvious is to add a criterion to the BYCELS criteria called "Time-In-Grade" and weight it heavily at the basic grade level. First of all we don't really believe we should eliminate the "Experience and Versatility" criterion and replace it with the Time-In-Grade criterion inasmuch as prime importance must be attached to the knowledge and experience gained as a result of

time-in-grade and not to time-in-grade, per se. Secondly, adding points for time-in-grade may help persons at the PCEL level but probably wouldn't help at the CCEL level as much as a high rating in "Experience and Versatility" would. Promotability is more directly affected if points for time-in-grade could be applied at the CCEL level, but, we simply couldn't figure out a way to do this either, at least in a way that wouldn't degrade the system.

Recommendation

- That the competitive evaluation system not incorporate time-in-grade per se as a promotion or evaluative factor.
- That Experience and Versatility be significantly weighted at the basic grade level to enhance the competitive standing of individuals at the basic grade level who have benefited professionally from their experiences. (See draft Annex C

STAT

IV. D.

4. Seniority

c. Benefits

Discussion

In addition to longevity certificates, pins, and CIARDS membership, what benefits accrue primarily as the result of seniority or length-of-service? The answer is, few, if any. What form of recognition and what benefits should accrue and, which of these, if any, are within our authority to confer?

We discussed this issue with respect to two categories of employees, namely, basic grade level employees with 15 years service and all others with 20 years of service or more (through GS-12).

It is the perception of some that the former group suffers from a front-ended promotion system, i.e., they reach the basic grade level within 3 years and then the majority receive nothing more in return for high level performance for perhaps the next ten years (QSI's excepted). The latter group, may or may not have recognition problems but, nevertheless, are not benefiting in any direct way from their seniority.

As a means of recognizing and rewarding basic grade level employees and others for long and faithful service, we believe we should identify benefits which are within our authority to confer or manage, and then formalize the procedure under which they are conferred. Realistically, however, we judge that the only major benefit affecting the quality-of-life of these employees that we have control over is assignments. A possibility also exists that we have some leeway in establishing a criteria (within the existing criteria) for granting special recognition (monetary) awards.

Recommendation

● That employees at basic grade level with 15 years service and all other OC employees through GS-12 with 20 years of service be given preferential treatment or recognition along the following lines:

(1) For assignment location and length

(2) Home leave length \*

● That all OC employees regardless of grade and total years of service receive a monetary special achievement award for:

(1) Ten years overseas duty,

(2) Fifteen years overseas duty,

(3) Twenty years overseas duty.

\* See OC Executive Board Recommendation, dated 4 December 1979.

## IV. D.

## 5. EVALUATION

## a. Counseling on Competitive Standing

Discussion

Competitive evaluation counseling is an essential element of OC's personnel management system. Through the mechanism of timely, factual, and regular feedback, employees are made aware of just how their performance, relative to their peers, is perceived by management. Regardless of whether or not they agree with the assessment, they are in a position to act on the information. Should they complain, transfer, resign, take a course, curb their temper, or do nothing? The responsibility is primarily theirs.

If feedback (counseling) is so important to employee and, ultimately, to the Office through increased productivity and effectiveness of its employees, should it be mandatory and forced on employees whether they want to know or not? Some hold that all employees should be told of their competitive standing annually to ensure they have no misconceptions about their performance and career progress. It is argued that in the long run this approach could benefit the employees by helping them to pragmatically adjust or modify their career goals/expectations in light of their annual progress or competitiveness. The Office benefits to the degree this forced feedback results in modifying employee behavior, and in general, improves morale by reducing or eliminating the seeds of disappointment, anger, and cynicism.

Most Task Force members felt, however, that although performance counseling is essential to the management of people, it should not be forced on those persons who really don't want to know (the bad news?). It was felt that employees more or less know their competitive situation and there is little to be gained by shattering illusions which permit them to function proficiently and with a modicum of pride. This would not apply, however, to those employees near or at the bottom of the CCEL because of poor performance.

Recommendation

© That management provide the opportunity for Comparative Evaluation Counseling to all employees on a voluntarily basis annually. As a minimum, such counseling will include potential descriptor and PCEL/CCEL standings.

- That the employees have the right to know PCEL/CCEL standings in either general or specific terms.
- That counseling be mandatory in all cases where low individual standing is of concern to management.

IV. D.

5. EVALUATION

b. Counseling the Good, but Non-competitive Employee

Discussion

There is a perception that productive but non-competitive employees, that is, long-time-in-grade employees, are down on themselves and have self-esteem problems. Assuming that this is true, we believe the problem could be ameliorated by counseling. This type of counseling would be aimed at educating these employees in the techniques of realistic goal setting and honest self-appraisal. It will help employees focus on what has been accomplished in terms of the person, the family, the job, and society, with the intent of making them feel better about themselves and more philosophical about their personal situation. For a program like this to succeed, OC managers must be sensitized to the problem and understand the need, among other things, not to unrealistically raise the expectations of their employees.

Recommendation

o That OMS/PSS or OTR be enlisted to help identify courses which can be used to educate OC managers and employees in the basic techniques of maintaining esteem.

## IV. D

## 6. Career Panel Structure

Discussion

There is general agreement that OC's career panel structure is sound. It provides management with an excellent tool for husbanding personnel resources.

The panels for the most part are comprised of groups of employees working in the same functional area. This, then, permits the panel manager to recruit, train, assign, and develop panel members along functional lines and in response to changing office requirements, thereby ensuring optimum effectiveness.

Panels should be managed in a way which ensures responsiveness to the needs of individual panel members, the members of other panels, and to office objectives and requirements. Among other things, panels should periodically review their numbers and grade structure, upward mobility structure, assignment procedures including cross-panel assignment considerations, training requirements, and counseling or feedback procedures.

On an office level, the number and kinds of panels should be reviewed periodically to ensure that proper groupings are maintained for managerial effectiveness and administrative efficiency. Past experience has demonstrated the wisdom of occasional revampings to meet changing technology and requirements. Examples include combining Panels T and C, eliminating a skill distinction within Panel N, moving managerial responsibility for a functional group from one panel to another, creation of new panels, etc. Our panel system clearly is a dynamic management tool and therein lies a great deal of its strength.

Panel "esprit" is an important consideration as it affects the individual panel members and line components. Although one can never measure the level of morale with any degree of certainty, it is self-evident that a well-managed panel is a positive influence on employee morale and by extension, these employees will invariably contribute to the effectiveness and morale of the line component to which they are assigned. Members of different panels do compare notes and, therefore, should be expected to be sensitive to real or imagined disparities in treatment and opportunities between panels. Because panel/employee morale is such a fragile thing, every effort should be made to ensure maximum communication and cooperation between panels to increase office

effectiveness and to minimize if not eliminate erroneous employee perceptions which could lead to an unwarranted lowering of morale.

One such morale factor discussed was the so-called "fast-track issue." If the majority feel that those identified (by whatever means) as having high potential for advancement are managed separately as an elite group outside of the normal competitive evaluation system, we can expect trouble. To what degree and how serious we don't know. In any case, when fast-trackers are managed within the OC panel framework, the risk of unrest is diminished.

Panel morale and, in this case, component morale can be affected adversely when the track is too fast. As an example, we would want to avoid a situation where advancement is so rapid the employee is not being given the time needed to mature in the job at each level. If promotion follows promotion, the employee must operate "flat out" just to stay on top of production requirements and has neither the time nor the experience to draw on to help others, i.e., to plan, to guide, to give counsel, to look to the future. The fast-trackers are usually under-the-gun of supervisors and subordinates alike so we should take care that they are ready to give as much to a job as they get out of it for everybody's sake.

Further centralization of panel management, while retaining the panel structure was also discussed at some length. Generally, those in favor of such a move believe that greater inter-panel mobility is needed to properly and quickly respond to rapidly changing job requirements which, in turn, affect the kinds and numbers of people required and available to do the work. Those against believe that they can produce better results more economically by controlling the recruitment and development of that segment of the work force which they must rely upon to perform their missions and functions. The Task Force is of the opinion that this issue is timely and needs further study.

Recommendation

- That Career Panel Chiefs should pay particular attention to identifying employees with excellent potential for advancement to ensure that an orderly plan for training and development is followed. (The aim is not to fast-track these individuals at the expense of time to mature in the job, but rather to protect against their getting bogged down because of a lack of adequate challenge or visibility.)
- That the CSB be required to develop an annual cross-panel assignment plan to provide managerial development experience.
- That qualification guidelines for inter panel transfers be established and published to promote equity and encourage employees to prepare for career enhancing opportunities.

IV. D.

7. EEO

Discussion

The Task Force reviewed the OC EEO program. The population distribution of women and minorities among OC technical and professional positions was noted and found to be below national averages. Discussions were held with the OC EEO representative to review the study which statistically examined BYCELS for indications of bias. The Task Force also discussed the OC policy of requiring uniform performance standards for all employees within a given skill or profession without regard to race, color, sex, or other EEO categories. Note was made of existing OC programs to provide upward mobility training at basic levels to broaden entrance opportunities for non-skilled persons.

The Task Force concluded that existing OC EEO policies and procedures are correct. The competition for limited numbers of women and minority technical and professional personnel is extremely keen, and OC, like many other government entities, is not highly competitive. The BYCELS study clearly failed to find sufficient basis for recommending bias-correcting change. In the opinion of our OC EEO representative, a separate EEO rating criteria is neither warranted nor wise.

Recommendation

- That the proposed new evaluation criteria be examined for unintentional bias.

IV. D.

8. System Understanding

Discussion

The Task Force wishes to note that understanding is the key to acceptance and support for the major cause of suspicion about the promotion and selection process. Present efforts to train and familiarize our people with the system should be continued and, where possible, strengthened, especially as an aftermath to changes which may ensue from this report.

We feel that every effort should be made to increase the type and quality of information that is disseminated and exchanged. This includes:

- (1) Continued use of the Career Sub-group Board as a forum for discussion, exchange, and introduction of ideas.
- (2) Continued use of the OC Mid-manager's Course and other OC courses for instruction and discussion.
- (3) Increased use of audio visual presentations.
- (4) Periodic seminars.
- (5) Continued use of Agency training courses on Career Counseling and Supervision.

Recommendation

- 0 That a combination of live briefings and media training aids be used to disseminate the approved portions of this report in the most timely manner possible.
- 0 That HRD be tasked to develop and maintain an ongoing employee/manager training program on OC's Performance Appraisal and Selection System to foster system understanding and ensure proper administration.
- 0 That the CSB schedule a periodic review of personnel management policies and procedures and recommend changes and revisions as appropriate.

## IV. E. Automation:

Discussion

The Task Force approached the subject of appraisal/selection and automation from an environmental standpoint and also from a status standpoint. In the first instance we perceived a technological capability to collect, store, manipulate and produce various reports for our Human Resources Management process. At the same time, we recognized the present semi-automated system as being relatively economical. Some envision a major drawdown in overseas staffing based on a three-base station configuration and possibly even the abolition of the Area Headquarters concept. As to status, the Task Force looked at OP/PERSIGN/PERSOC with its OC/COMCON/E enhancements and came away impressed both as to current capabilities and as to unexploited opportunities. Underlying questions to be answered are "What role should ADP play in this area, how much should OC invest in this approach to personnel management and appraisal? Can ADP replace partially or totally the human function in the appraisal process? What role would employee/management acceptance play in any degree of automation of the evaluative process?"

The OC COMCON system is fully operational in the context of its original design concept and has proven to be a powerful management tool. For the two panels (D and N) whose data is presently stored and accessible, we can now produce a wide range of reports in a wide variety of formats keyed on the large number of data fields contained in the system.

The Task Force was impressed with the ADP work already done in support of OC personnel management and is of the opinion that the potential for future exploitation is considerable. The first question that comes to mind is how field (Area) PCEL's would or could be conducted in the absence of an area organizational structure. The PCEL process requires a body of manpower which is collectively knowledgeable of the group being evaluated. Without an area structure, the capability to pull such a group together would be difficult at best. The question that needs to be answered is whether COMCON/E can be expanded and our appraisal process restructured to accomplish the PCEL process through automation while maintaining employee acceptability and economy of operation. The Task Force can envision a system of data collection by questionnaire with computerized pre-processing for final CCEL use. This opportunity should be explored before time and events force further major changes in the present area structure.

Should the time come when greater use of ADP is made in the PCEL/CCEL process, the Task Force believes that all data for all panels should be contained in COMCON/E. The power of the present system to produce management reports is limited to Panels D and N today and thus will continue to be a limited resource until such time as a complete OC data base is available.

Recommendations:

- That OC utilize its existing automated system (COMCON/E) to the benefit of all OC panels in areas involving employee assignment, statistical analysis, yearly employee PCEL profile reports, PCEL eligibility lists, etc.
- That HRD serve as the common control for OC's usage/application/training/change of COMCON/E.
- That OC commit resources including manpower for active and continued research in determining the role automation should play in any future appraisal or selection functions. (Estimate one person two-years.)

CC HANDBOOK

UNCLASSIFIED

## CEL SCHEDULE

Grade	PCEL Those on Duty in Your Area or Component on:	End of CEL & PAR PERIOD:	PAR due in Hqs. by:	AREA/Component PCEL's Due in Hqs. by:	CCEL Completed by:	Promoted by First Pay Period:	Optional Semi-Annual Promotion:
GS-15 & above	30 Sept.	31 Mar.	30 Apr.	15 May	31 May	July	Jan.
GS-14	31 Oct.	30 Apr.	31 May	15 June	31 July	Sept.	March
GS-13	31 Dec.	30 June	31 July	15 Aug.	30 Sept.	Nov.	May
GS-12	31 Jan.	31 July	31 Aug.	15 Sept.	31 Oct.	Dec.	June
GS-11	28 Feb.	31 Aug.	30 Sept.	15 Oct.	30 Nov.	Jan.	July
GS-10 & GS-09	31 Mar.	30 Sept.	31 Oct.	15 Nov.	31 Dec.	Feb.	Aug.
GS-08 & GS-07	30 June	31 Dec.	31 Jan.	15 Feb.	31 Mar.	May	Nov.
GS-06	31 July	31 Jan.	28 Feb.	15 Mar.	30 Apr.	June	Dec.
GS-05 & below	30 Sept.	31 Mar.	30 Apr.	15 May	30 June	UN S C H E D U L E D	

Date: 2 July 1979

UNCLASSIFIED

Page 1

Draft Appendices to Office of Communications

Personnel Management Handbook

STAT



- Appendix A - BYCEL-II CEL Schedule
- Appendix B - BYCELS-II Evaluation Criteria, attached
- Appendix C - BYCELS-II Preliminary Panel Rating Form, attached
- Appendix D - BYCELS-II Characteristic Weight Table, attached
- Appendix E - BYCELS-II Preliminary Panel Ranking Form, attached
- Appendix F - BYCELS-II Consolidated CEL Panel Ranking Sheet, attached

STAT

Appendix B to

## BYCELS-II INSTRUCTIONS

STAT

1. BYCELS-II is the competitive evaluation criteria used by the Office of Communications to evaluate and rank personnel at and above the basic grade in all OC career panels. BYCELS-II is an integral part of  and is to be used in accordance with the policies and procedures contained therein.

2. BYCELS-II consists of 14 criteria describing the characteristics or traits against which OC employees are to be evaluated. Individuals are compared against each criterion and given a numerical rating on a scale of 1 to 7, keyed to the descriptive statement which the Preliminary Panel believes best describes the person. Ratings of 2, 4, and 6 have such descriptive statements while ratings of 1, 3, 5, and 7 do not. The ratings without descriptors are to be used when the descriptive statements do not quite match the employee.

3. OC believes its employees are exceptional, yet this belief must be balanced against the natural tendency to overrate. Although, in the final analysis, Preliminary Panels must rely upon their own experience to guard against inflated ratings, the following guidelines should be considered:

a. The statement for a rating of 4 describes the typical OC employee.

b. A rating of 7 is intended only for those individuals whose performance is clearly exceptional when compared to their peers.

c. Similarly, a rating of 1 is intended only for those individuals whose performance is well below that of their peers.

4. The rating number selected is to be recorded in the RATING column of the Preliminary Panel Rating Form. Next, the appropriate weights assigned to each criterion are entered in the WEIGHT column. The criterion rating number is then multiplied by the weight, and the product entered in the TOTAL column. Finally, these 14 totals are added together and entered in the TOTAL SCORE box.

5. Next, all employees will be ranked on the Preliminary Panel Ranking Sheet according to their TOTAL SCORE. The employee with the highest TOTAL SCORE is listed first with the others listed below in order of decreasing TOTAL SCORE.

6. The Preliminary Panel Rating Form and the Preliminary Panel Ranking Sheet are to be completed using employee numbers and forwarded to Headquarters.

7. Preliminary Panels are encouraged to attach comments which will help to explain an individual's ranking, or which will better describe strengths, weaknesses, or other needs.

1 PRODUCTIVITY

Consider the quantity and accuracy of work, and the degree to which assigned tasks are completed within the time allotted. Also consider the level of effort applied to assigned tasks and the impact that stress or pressure has on the individual's output.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Works fairly steadily although improvement is needed in one or more areas such as quantity, accuracy, or timeliness.

3

4 Does own share of work accurately, thoroughly, and in the time allotted. Under normal pressure, no significant decrease in quantity or attention to detail occurs.

5

6 Is a hard worker who consistently produces a high volume of output that is accurate, thorough, and in advance of most deadlines. When under pressure, no decrease in productivity occurs.

7

## 2 KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

Consider the degree to which the individual possesses the specific technical and related knowledge and skills necessary to perform the assigned job.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Requires improvement in one or more elements of basic knowledge and skills in order to perform effectively.

3

4 Has the knowledge and skills to fully understand the assigned job and to perform effectively in most situations.

5

6 Clearly has the knowledge and skills to perform assigned tasks in an exceptional manner.

7

3 DEPENDABILITY

Consider the degree to which the individual is reliable, punctual, and responsive to tasking.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Needs greater self-discipline in order to be reliable and more responsive to the needs of the Office.

3

4 Is disciplined, reliable, and is generally responsive to the needs of the Office.

5

6 Has proven to be dependable in difficult situations and always available for tasking to meet the needs of the Office.

7

#### 4 ADAPTABILITY

Consider the individual's ability to adapt to a variety of new situations resulting from changes made to procedures, personnel, policy, and the work environment. This includes the ability to understand the change as well as the reason for it, and the degree to which the individual refines and promotes acceptance of new approaches.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Requires a detailed explanation to understand new situations, and does little to promote acceptance of change.

3

4 Understands new situations following a brief explanation, and works to promote acceptance of changes.

5

6 Requires little or no help to understand and function in new situations, and actively works to refine and encourage acceptance of the change.

7

5 WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Consider such factors as grammar, clarity, organization, and the ability to use a style appropriate for the task or type of correspondence.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Correspondence requires improvement in grammar, clarity, or organization.

3

4 Correspondence is substantively complete, requiring only minor editing to improve style, clarity, or organization.

5

6 Correspondence is clear, well-organized, easily understood, and seldom requires more than stylistic change.

7

6 OTHER COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS

Excluding writing, consider the ability to exchange information with others.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Ability to express ideas or to understand others needs improvement.

3

4 Expresses ideas well, is a good listener, and is generally successful at eliciting and sharing information with others.

5

6 Expresses complex ideas with ease, is a careful and attentive listener, and is adept at eliciting and sharing information with others.

7

7 INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

Consider the individual's ability to represent the Office and Organization, and to work effectively with others.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Attitude, appearance, or cooperativeness needs improvement.

3

4 Successfully represents the Office and Organization in situations normally encountered, maintains good relations, and works effectively with others.

5

6 Is an excellent representative in most situations and, even in difficult circumstances, is able to establish and maintain excellent working relationships with both groups and individuals.

7

8 INNOVATIVENESS

Consider the individual's talent for developing and suggesting better methods or procedures, and also the degree to which the individual recognizes and supports suggestions made by others.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Efforts to develop and suggest better ways of doing things, and to assist others in refining their ideas must be increased.

3

4 Is resourceful in developing and suggesting better ways to do things and gives due consideration to the suggestions of others.

5

6 Repeatedly demonstrates the ability to develop and suggest new or better ways to do things, and carefully considers and helps refine the suggestions of others.

7

9 EXPERIENCE AND VERSATILITY

Consider the variety of positions for which the individual is qualified based upon factors such as the number and type of previous assignments.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Requires additional assignments to gain broader experience within the career discipline.

3

4 Has acquired sufficient experience to handle a variety of assignments at a reasonable level within the career discipline.

5

6 Has broad experience which allows assignment to almost any job at a reasonable level in the career discipline and in related functional areas.

7

10 PROBLEM SOLVING

Consider the individual's ability to recognize the problem, to understand related factors, to choose the logical solution from among alternatives, and to plan, organize, and implement a course of action.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Requires improvement in understanding and applying some problem solving techniques.

3

4 Correctly analyzes most problems routinely encountered, properly identifies a course of action, and organizes the available resources to implement the solution.

5

6 Consistently analyzes problems correctly, selects the best course of action, and obtains needed resources. Problems are invariable solved.

7

11 INITIATIVE

Consider the degree to which the individual seeks additional tasks and responsibilities, and takes advantage of opportunities to offer meaningful contributions. Also consider the amount of supervision the individual requires, the degree to which assistance is provided to others, and efforts made toward self-improvement.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Efforts to acquire additional responsibility, to offer meaningful contributions, and to work with less supervision need improvement.

3

4 Requires minimal supervision, seeks additional responsibility, and offers meaningful contributions when the opportunity arises.

5

6 Consistently strives for greater responsibility and seldom misses an opportunity to prepare for more demanding jobs by broadening perspective and knowledge.

7

## 12 LEADERSHIP

Consider the openness and honesty with which the individual deals with others. For those who supervise, also consider their ability to use the authority of their position to effectively direct the efforts of subordinates. For those who do not supervise, consider their ability to influence others, including the degree to which the individual is looked to for guidance.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Must be more honest with others; supervisors must improve their efforts to direct subordinates effectively, and be more concerned with subordinate morale and development; those who do not supervise must improve their efforts or ability to influence others.

3

4 Is honest with others; supervisors use their authority to effectively guide and direct others with due concern for employee morale and developmental needs; those who do not supervise are occasionally consulted for guidance and generally exert a positive influence on others.

5

6 Has integrity; supervisors inspire and help others to develop, and offer guidance which is readily followed; those who do not supervise always exert a good influence on others and are consistently asked for advice.

7

13 DECISION MAKING AND JUDGMENT

Consider the individual's ability to make correct decisions, especially when the available information is incomplete, ambiguous, or conflicting.

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 Must more carefully consider the facts to improve the quality of decisions.

3

4 After careful consideration of the available information most decisions are timely and correct.

5

6 Carefully considers the available information, deals comfortably with ambiguity, and consistently renders sound judgments.

7

14 COURAGE OF CONVICTION

Consider the degree to which the individual, within reason, effectively asserts sound, well-developed ideas with the conviction that they are best for the Office, without regard to the risk of being wrong. (Not to be confused with single-mindedness or stubbornness.)

Select the rating which comes closest to describing this employee.

1

2 More frequent expression of personal views and opinions is required.

3

4 Often advocates and defends honestly held views and opinions, which are sound and well-developed.

5

6 Consistently advocates and defends views, and attempts to persuade others to change even in the face of opposing or more popular views.

7

CLASSIFY AS APPROPRIATE

## PRELIMINARY PANEL RATING FORM Appendix C

EMPLOYEE NBR _____		PCEL YEAR _____	
NAME OF EMPLOYEE (Last/First M.I.) _____		PANEL MC _____	GRADE _____ DATE OF GRADE (Day-Mon-Yr) _____
ASSIGNMENT LOCATION _____	COMPONENT/AREA PREPARING CEL _____	PCEL RANKING _____	DATE PCEL PREPARED (Day-Mon-Yr) _____
CRITERIA	WEIGHT	RATING	TOTAL
1. Productivity			
2. Knowledge and Skills			
3. Dependability			
4. Adaptability			
5. Written Communications			
6. Other Communications Skills			
7. Interpersonal Relations			
8. Innovativeness			
9. Experience and Versatility			
10. Problem Solving			
11. Initiative			
12. Leadership			
13. Decision Making and Judgment			
14. Courage of Conviction			
15.			
16.			
		TOTAL SCORE	
REMARKS:			

## APPENDIX D

STAT

## CHARACTERISTIC WEIGHTS

Characteristic	GS-3 thru 9	GS-10	GS-11	GS-12	GS-13, 14, 15
1. Productivity	2	2	2	2	2
2. Knowledge and Skills	2	2	2	2	2
3. Dependability	2	2	1	1	1
4. Adaptability	3	3	3	4	4
5. Written Communications	1	2	3	4	4
6. Other Communications Skills	1	1	2	2	2
7. Interpersonal Relations	2	2	3	4	4
8. Innovativeness	1	2	3	3	3
9. Experience and Versatility	4	3	3	2	2
10. Problem Solving	2	3	3	4	4
11. Initiative	2	2	3	4	4
12. Leadership	1	2	3	4	5
13. Decision Making and Judgment	3	3	3	4	4
14. Courage of Conviction	1	2	3	4	5

CLASSIFY AS APPROPRIATE

[illegible]

SIGNATURE OF AREA/COMPONENT CHIEF

## APPENDIX F

(CLASSIFY AS APPROPRIATE)

STAT

## CONSOLIDATED CEL PANEL RANKING SHEET

P/		GRADE		DATE	
NBR	MASTER LIST NAME	EMPLOYEE NBR	DESC	DEVELOPMENT LIST (List Alphabetically)	DESCRIPTOR
				<b>TO BE DELETED</b>	

PANEL CHAIRMAN :

PANEL MEMBERS :

SIGNATURE OF CHIEF CAREER SUB-GROUP

SIGNATURE OF CAREER PANEL CHIEF

FORM 4-70 3491A USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS

☐ DCL ☐ RVW

DRY

BY

(CLASSIFY AS APPROPRIATE)